



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

from which the Old English version (given in Dr. Bright's *Reader*) was made—the poem as a work of art, and the argument of the poem. The introduction is very brief, and I should have liked to see a fuller treatment of these points. The author has chosen “blank verse as the most suitable metre for the translation of a long and dignified narrative poem,” but some of it is very prosaic. He objects, and rightly, to the ballad measure used by Lumsden in his translation of *Beowulf*, and strongly condemns the imitation of the Old English alliterative measure, but I can not agree with him here, and think that a spirited translation in this measure would have given the modern reader a better impression of the Old English poem than his blank verse does. However, I am thankful for this translation, as none exists in English since that of Kemble in 1843, long since out of print.

I am more inclined to agree with Prof. JOHN LESSLIE HALL, of William and Mary College, who has just given us original specimens of the Old English alliterative measure in his *Old English Idyls* (Boston, 1899), which show that this measure can be reasonably well imitated in original verse. Not that I think that Prof. Hall has succeeded perfectly, but these Idyls are fairly well done, and do not deserve the reproach that Mr. Root casts on such imitations.

The small volume contains eight idyls, entitled ‘The Calling of Hengist and Horsa, the Landing of Hengist and Horsa, the Lady Rowena, the Death of Horsa, Cerdic and Arthur, Augustine, Alfred, and Edgar the Peaceable.’ I have noted several points to which I should take exception in the execution, but can not take time and space for them now. The half-rime does not produce a pleasant impression on the ear, nor does the frequent repetition of ‘lecherous, treacherous,’ and such-like; I find both *scop* and *scōp*, *burnies* and *byrnies*, *décorous* and *decórous*, *ogle*, *a-many*, as adjective (30, 50), but rightly “a many of jewels” (45), *nidering* for *niding* or *nithing*, *a-mighty*, *a-dreary*, and I should transpose some words for the sake of the accent,—but these slight blemishes can be easily remedied, and I think that the author has, on the whole, succeeded very well in his metrical imitations.

J. M. GARNETT.

La doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brâhmanas, par SYLVAIN LÉVI.  
(Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes-Études. Sciences religieuses. Vol. XI.) Paris, 1898.

Seven years ago Professor Bloomfield, in the announcement of his Vedic Concordance (Proceed. A. O. S. for 1892, Journal, XV, p. clxxiii), admirably summed up the chief desiderata of Vedic

philology, viz. (1) complete indices verborum for all texts; (2) preliminary translations of all texts; (3) an index of subjects and ideas contained in the Vedic literature; and (4) a concordance of the *mantras*. Professor Lévi's book falls under the third of these classes, for with great care he has here attempted to give "un inventaire doctrinal" of the Brāhmanical teachings concerning the sacrifice; a specimen, as it were, of a large Brāhmaṇa Concordance which he also considers "un des outils indispensables à la philologie védique." The value of such work is twofold. To the student of the Vedic hymns, on the one hand, it presents the theological views of a period which has its beginning and roots in these very hymns and can not properly be separated from them. "Le système religieux des Brāhmaṇas se retache par une tradition continue aux auteurs des hymnes." And it is, perhaps, on this account to be regretted that our author has confined himself so strictly to the Brāhmaṇas alone. The 'connective tissue' between the earlier and the later period which Professor Bloomfield so strongly desired is thus almost wholly wanting. He, however, who remembers the vast mass even so to be gone through will be slow to find fault with M. Lévi for his voluntary restriction. On the other hand, it is investigations of this kind which will ultimately enable us to form a clear conception concerning the composition of the Brāhmanical writings and their relation to each other.<sup>1</sup> Considering the great importance which these critical questions have for the proper valuation of the legendary and sociological information contained in the Brāhmaṇas, our present lack of definite knowledge constantly tends to vitiate our inferences based on Brāhmanic testimony. To illustrate by one example:—On p. 155 M. Lévi refers to the AB. version of the legend of the *asurī* Dīrghajihvī in which Mitra and Varuṇa are *dramatis personae*. But does the Dīrghajihvī legend really belong to the Varuṇa cycle? By no means. This legend in its original form is an Indra legend, and as such it is told both in the TMB. and in the JB. It is only by a trick quite characteristic of the Brāhmanical authors that Varuṇa in the AB. version is substituted for Indra, and the sole reason for this substitution is that the legend in the AB. is used to explain why the *payasyā*-offering at the morning libation is made to Mitra and Varuṇa. It is clear that such an exegetical adaptation of a popular legend is of little value to the mythologist. (Cf. Actes du XI<sup>me</sup> Congrès international des Orientalistes, I, pp. 232-6.)

In preparing his digest M. Lévi could not fail to be struck with the fundamental similarity of the Brāhmanical writings, and he infers from this that "un trésor commun d'aphorismes, de sentences, d'anecdotes, de légendes circulait dans les clans sacerdotaux; . . . chacune des grandes écoles qui l'avaient adopté l'avait par une altération inconsciente accommodé à son génie

<sup>1</sup> Bloomfield's analysis of the GB. in JAOS. XIX, 2d half, p. 1 ff., is a model of such an investigation.

propre, . . . mais partout l'original unique apparaît vigoureusement sous les retouches." That there was such a collection in the form of a real book (Geldner, *Ved. Stud.* I, p. 290), I agree with Oldenberg (GGA. 1890, I, p. 419, and *Deut. Lit. Zeit.* 1897, col. 731), is not yet proven, although there is no evidence whatever to disprove it. But that a certain amount of legendary and dogmatic stock in trade, cast in definite and accepted forms, existed in the prebrāhmanic period and was freely drawn upon by the compilers of our present Brāhmaṇas seems to me to admit of no doubt. (Cf. also JAOS. XVIII, p. 16, and Finot in the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, XXXVI, p. 445.) A detailed discussion of this problem lay outside of M. Lévi's plan, but from his words on p. 8 it may perhaps be hoped that he has only deferred it till some later date. It will necessitate an even more complete collection and minute comparison of all the passages bearing on any one subject than was necessary for the purpose of the present monograph.

A whole chapter is devoted to the mechanical theory of the sacrifice which permeates the Brāhmanical writings. There is probably no race which exhibits what Vierkandt (*Naturvölker und Kulturvölker*, 1896, p. 297 ff.) terms the intellectualistic type of civilization in a higher degree than the Hindoos of the Brāhmanical period. The ideal man is he who knows (*ya evaṃ veda*). I know of only one passage in the whole mass of Brāhmanical literature where our ethelistic morality finds expression, viz. BĀU. iii. 2. 14 (ed. Boethl.). At the close of a public disputation Yājñavalkya takes Ārthabhāga, his adversary, aside and confides to him the *summum arcanum*: "Verily what these two then talked about,—it was action they then talked about; what they lauded,—it was action they then lauded; to wit, through good action one becomes good, through bad action, bad."

In discussing the passages relating to retribution after death, M. Lévi, like Deussen in his learned *Philosophy of the Upaniṣads* (*Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*, I. Band, 2te Abteil., 1899, p. 292), omits a reference to a very characteristic statement of the KB., "qui," as he himself notes on p. 21, "se distingue souvent par une tendance morale." In KB. xi. 3 we read: "For, verily, as in this world men eat animals, as they partake of them, even so in yonder world the animals eat men, even so they partake of them. Now by means of the *prātaranuvāka* he encloses them here. Being here enclosed they do not eat him in yonder world, they do not partake of him. But just as he eats them in this world, just as he partakes of them, even so he eats them in yonder world, he partakes of them"—a very close parallel to a certain passage in the Bṛghu legend (JB. i. 43).

A few additions may finally be noted. To the note on p. 19 add AB. vi. 35. 1.—P. 35. For RV. i. 164. 45 compare Oldenberg, ZDMG. XXXIX 58.—P. 71. "La morale n'a rien à faire dans le monde des dieux" is not to any degree characteristic of

Hindoo mythology. Early myths all over the world are unmoral, and a later generation to which unmoral and immoral have become synonymous is sorely tried to effect a compromise with its new ethical ideals. Witness Pindar wrestling with the Pelops legend in Olymp. I and Plato's discussion in the Rep. II 377.—P. 87. A language peculiar to the gods (add ÇB. xi. 5. 4. 4) is also found in Greece (cf. Graefenhan, Archiv f. Philol. u. Paedag. 1842 = Jahrb. f. Philol. u. Paedag., Supplementb. 8, p. 61, and Nauck, *ibid.*, p. 548) and in Germany (Grimm, *Mythol.*, p. 307).—P. 91. For the importance of the *dakṣiṇā* cf. also AB. vi. 35. 11.—P. 107. To note 2 add AB. i. 22. 14.—P. 108. Concerning *ṣraddhā* cf. Oldenberg, ZDMG. 50, 448.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

HANNS OERTEL.

L'adjectif verbal latin en *-ndus*. Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique, XI 145-164, par J. LEBRETON.

Studien zur Geschichte der lateinischen Wortbildung. Das Suffix *-do-*. Indogermanische Forschungen, X 221-234.

Readers of this Journal know how fully the gerundive has been treated in its pages. A review of two recent papers in their bearings on this question will perhaps not be uninteresting.

Lebreton's synopsis of the previous theories is of great bibliographical interest. The synopsis in my essay on 'The Origin of the Gerundive' (Transactions of the American Philological Association, XXIX 5-30) is not nearly so complete.

Lebreton has, in my opinion, made a valuable contribution to the discussion of this formation. He brings into comparison with the gerundive the Greek stems in *-ad-*. His list is *φυγας* 'fugitive,' *ρνας* 'flowing,' *δρομας* 'runner,' *φορβας* 'nourishing,' *νομας* 'pasturing,' *στροφας* 'turning,' *εθας* 'habitual,' *φοιρας* 'wandering,' *κυκλας* 'rolling'; and, with past meaning, *μυγας* 'mixed,' *σπορας* 'scattered,' *λογας* 'chosen,' *γυμνας* 'stripped,' *μονας* 'isolated.' These do in fact seem to me to betray a kinship with the type of Latin *labundus* 'falling,' *oriundus* 'arising,' *secundus* 'following,' *volvendus* 'rolling'; and, purely adjective, *rotundus* 'round' (from 'rolling'). It was with precisely this type of words that the infinitival theory which I advanced in this Journal had its only semantic difficulty.

My theory started with the dat.-gen. fem. sg. in *-dae*, which it made the precise equivalent of *-θαι* in the Greek infinitive, while *-endae* was, barring an unimportant difference in case-ending, the equivalent of the Sanskrit infinitive in *-a-dhyāi*. It must be noted, however, that under absolute conditions of transmission the gen. in *-di* would correspond to *-θαι*, and *-dae* (fem. sg.) to a primitive *-DHĀI*—intermediate, we may suppose, between *-θαι* and *-dhyāi*. It is also safe to say that the ending *-DHĀI* moving along